



MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN TASK FORCE

MEETING NOTES

APRIL 13, 2004

4:00 P.M.

ROOM 113

Task Force Members Present	Nye Bond, Susan Dunn, Duane Eitel, Margaret Hall, Elaine Hammer, Rick Krueger, Marian Malone, Bill McCoy, Eric Miller, Oscar Pohirieth, Patte Newman, Gordon Scholz, Terry Werner. (Kit Boesch, Greg MacLean, Tad McDowell absent)
Resource Panel Members Present	Mike Brienzo, Terry Genrich, Brian Mathers, Larry Worth, Jerry Wray
Others Present	Steve Burnham, Alvin Lugn, Brian Praeuner, Mike Schaefer, Alan Wickman, Kent Morgan, David Cary, Michele Abendroth

Agenda Topics

1. Call Meeting to Order

Mr. Morgan called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2. Public Comment Period (10 min. maximum)

Alan Wickman reiterated his belief that the City should employ a Pedestrian and Bicycle Coordinator and emphasized the importance of having a process to tap into the knowledge base of the bicycling community.

3. Task Force Member Final Recommendation Preferences

Mr. Morgan asked each of the Task Force members to state one recommendation they would like to have included in the final report.

Mr. Scholz stated that in order to keep the momentum going, he believes there is a need for a Pedestrian and Bicycle Coordinator and/or an advisory group.

Mr. Eitel noted that he feels it is important to restrict low density periphery development around the City.

Mr. Pohirieth believes that we should concentrate efforts on bettering the quality of the

transportation services in the under-served areas. As an example, perhaps a shuttle service could be created on 27th Street that would go to Lincoln East, Park Middle School and Superior Street.

Mr. Werner believes it is important to put together a plan and implement that plan. To accomplish this, we may need to have a community advocate position.

Ms. Malone wants to see some bus service in every part of town. She believes we need to maintain what we have and not cut anything in the hopes that some day the bus service will be better.

Mr. Miller stated that his highest priority is constructing a multi-modal transportation center in downtown.

Ms. Dunn noted that anything that we put forth, someone has to make sure everything is integrated, so she would support a coordinator.

Ms. Hall stated that she believes it is important to enhance the Handi-Van service and to farm out some of the Handi-Van services to the cab companies and other transportation companies.

Mr. Bond feels that it is important to have a vision statement on what we would hope transportation would look like and that it would attract people to Lincoln. Related to that is the education piece and promoting that vision.

Mr. Krueger noted that he would like to see an enterprise fund for the trails system. He suggested appropriating keno funds, which appear to be for discretionary use, for trails.

Ms. Hammer feels that we need to support a well-maintained bicycle transportation system for both commuting and physical fitness. The University needs to be a big player in this.

Mr. McCoy stated that with respect to land development, we need to emphasize interconnected street concepts in housing developments.

Ms. Newman stated that we need a realistic, efficient system that starts with the core area. In order to achieve that, we need a coordinator, who is a planner and can address a wide range of issues

Mr. Werner responded to Mr. Krueger's comment by noting that keno funds are designated to parks, social services, and libraries.

4. Bicycle Lane Report

Mr. Cary began his PowerPoint presentation by addressing bicycle lanes. The purpose of the report on *Bicycle Lanes* was to pull together the basic information on what bicycle lanes are. Another purpose was to identify that if we have bicycle lanes, we need to do a formal implementation program. A sub-committee made up of several organizations was formed to look at this issue.

A big part of the study was to identify standards. Another major part of the report identified the primary and secondary factors that would be needed to implement this program. The report also identified suggested corridors to be further studied. The next step is to include this concept in the Multi-Modal Transportation Task Force final report and to address it in the Downtown Master Plan process. If bicycle lanes are implemented, a formal implementation program would need to be developed, a funding source identified, and we would need to begin studying suggested bike lane routes.

Mr. Werner asked if diagonal parking would be excluded if there is a bike lane in downtown. Mr. Cary responded by noting that the standards say bike lanes should not be used if there is diagonal parking, but it does not exclude it. If on-street parking is needed, it should be parallel parking.

Mr. Miller commented that there needs to be better coordination between the City and the University.

5. GPTN Survey Results

Mr. Cary reviewed the results of the Great Plains Trails Network (GPTN) bike survey. He asked the Task Force to keep in mind the fact that GPTN members are users and advocates of the trails system, so the results could be slightly skewed. The survey was sent to members of GPTN in their newsletter, and there was a 25% response rate. There were 21 questions asking about the level of importance or satisfaction with several concepts. There were also specific questions regarding the use of the trails and the ideal bike trail width.

Question 16 which asked about showers and changing areas at destinations along bike routes, received the lowest support. This was the only question that fell below a rating of 2.5 out of a possible 4. Questions 10 (maintaining the trail system at a high level) and 11 (expansion of the trail system) received the highest rankings, of 3.84 and 3.77, respectively.

The respondents showed general satisfaction with the overall system (rating of 3.32), and the signage on the trail system (rating of 3.02), but the signage on the on-street bicycle route system (rating of 2.55) received much less support.

A majority of the users (75.5%) of the trail system use the dedicated bike trails versus 9.4% using unsigned minor roadways, 5.2% using unsigned major roadways, and 1.7% using signed on-street bike routes.

The most common activity while using the trail system is biking at 60.5 %, compared to 23.6% for walking, and 12% for running/jogging.

The primary reason for using the trail system was for recreational purposes (86.7%), followed by commuting (7.3%) and running errands (0.9%).

In comparing bikers and walkers/joggers, walkers and joggers are more adamant about the importance of concepts, are generally less satisfied, and want wider trails. In comparing the

recreational user with commuters, commuters feel that using the right-of-way for bike lanes and providing bike lockers are more important. Recreational users feel that the trails need to be wider than do commuters. Commuters are less satisfied with the bicycle system.

When comparing the survey results of the GPTN members and Multi-Modal Transportation Task Force members, the Task Force members felt the ideal trail width should be 11.33 feet compared to 10.26 for GPTN respondents. The Task Force members are much less satisfied with the bicycle system and signing of trails and bike routes, less supportive of ideas for bike lanes and a bike advocate, and more supportive of the idea of bike showers, changing areas and bike lockers.

6. Special Transportation Services Report

Mr. Cary continued his PowerPoint presentation with the topic of Coordination of Special Transportation Services. Special transportation services are the use of public or private buses, van, or taxis for transportation services for citizens that are in need of services most due to a disability or medical condition that limits their mobility. The idea of coordination of services has been studied and supported by many reports and efforts. Coordination can provide significant cost savings.

Lincoln has been providing this service since 1972, prior to the federal requirement. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 requires fixed-route transit providers to offer comparable paratransit service to individuals with disabilities who are unable to use fixed-route service, and it must be handicapped accessible. StarTran has been in compliance since 1993. Service along a fixed-route has to be provided within three-quarters of a mile on each side of that route.

One of the services that provides for the ADA requirement is the HandiVan Program. It provides service Monday through Friday from 5:15 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and on Saturdays from 5:15 a.m. to 7:10 p.m. This goes beyond the ADA requirement with evening weekday service. It is a \$2 fare with a cost to StarTran of \$35 per trip. Users must be registered and found to be ADA eligible.

Another service is the Brokerage Program. This is a service provided through Servant Cabs and Transport Plus that allows for more service accommodation during peak loading hours of the HandiVan Program. It is available during the same service hours as HandiVan and costs approximately \$12 per trip.

There are approximately 40 other private and semi-private providers of special transportation. They are not required to provide service according to ADA requirements as StarTran does. Fares are approximately \$10-15 per trip. At this time, there is no coordination of these programs.

Multiple past reports and efforts indicate a need for coordination of special transportation services. Coordination will decrease duplication of programs and cut operating costs by up to 25%. Implementation of a coordination program over a multi-year period should be attempted. There is a current effort with the lead agency being the League of Human Dignity. They are

suggesting an initial pilot program with 4-6 current special transportation providers. It would be a 3-year program with a total cost of \$275,000 and includes hiring a temporary full-time transportation coordinator position. The League currently has multiple applications for grants.

Mr. Werner asked if there is a reason for the lack of coordination. Mr. Worth pointed out that the Carter Goble study didn't suggest that every agency would be coordinated. It acknowledged that some agencies have special needs. Mr. Schaefer noted that this is a collaborative effort among StarTran and the community health partners. The League has been involved with this issue for many years and would like to maximize the resources in providing services to older citizens and people with disabilities. They hope that this could expand to other populations in the future. They believe it has promise. Over time, there will be a cost savings to the programs and in the end, at least part of those savings can go to help continue the project beyond the three-year pilot period. They are not asking the 4-6 organizations providing transportation for anything. They hope to offer incentives for participation; however, down the road, they may be asked for something. Theoretically, the benefits to them will outweigh the cost.

Mr. Morgan stated that the Task Force will be asked to endorse this coordination effort in their final report.

7. Adjourn

Mr. Morgan adjourned the meeting at 5:28 p.m.

F:\FILES\PLANNING\Multi-modal trans\Minutes\Meeting Notes 04 13 04.wpd